

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/826;286	04/19/2004	Wai Mun Lee	060937-0127-01US	9926
9629 7590 09/21/2004 MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP 1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW			EXAMINER	
			DELCOTTO, GREGORY R	
WASHINGTON, DC 20004			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1751	
			DATE MAILED: 09/21/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/826,286	LEE ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Gregory R. Del Cotto	1751			
The MAILING I Period for Reply	DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
THE MAILING DATE  - Extensions of time may be a after SIX (6) MONTHS from  - If the period for reply specification of the period for reply is specification.  - Failure to reply within the second	OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 the mailing date of this communication.  ed above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply cified above, the maximum statutory period w  at or extended period for reply will, by statute, ffice later than three months after the mailing	IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH( 66(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE date of this communication, even if timely filed	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1) Responsive to 0	communication(s) filed on <u>08 Se</u>	eptember 2004.				
2a) ☐ This action is F	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3) Since this appli	S) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accord	dance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>20-47</u>	is/are pending in the application	l <b>.</b>				
4a) Of the above	e claim(s) is/are withdraw	n from consideration.				
5) Claim(s)	is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>20-47</u>	is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s)	is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s)	are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.				
Application Papers						
9) ☐ The specification	is objected to by the Examiner					
10) The drawing(s) f	iled on is/are: a)□ acce	pted or b) objected to by the E	xaminer.			
Applicant may no	t request that any objection to the d	rawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	37 CFR 1.85(a).			
Replacement drav	wing sheet(s) including the correction	on is required if the drawing(s) is obje	ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
11)☐ The oath or decl	aration is objected to by the Exa	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119					
a) All b) Son  1. Certified of  2. Certified of  3. Copies of  applicatio	ne * c) None of: copies of the priority documents copies of the priority documents the certified copies of the priori n from the International Bureau	have been received in Application ty documents have been received	on No d in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)						
) Notice of References Cited	d (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary (				
	atent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Dat				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/3.</u>	tement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) /04.	6) Other:	тент Аррікаціон (ЕТО-152)			

Art Unit: 1751

## **DETAILED ACTION**

The preliminary amendment filed 9/8/04 has been entered. Claims 1-19 have been canceled. Claims 20-47 are pending. Note that, it appears in the continuing data in the specification, Applicant has incorrectly stated that "08/654007 is a divisional of 08/078657." It appears that 08/654007 is a continuation of 08/078657. Clarification is required. Additionally, the Examiner asserts that the effective filing date of the instant claims is 6/28/03 which is the filing date of 08/078657. Also, it appears that once the double patenting rejections have been overcome as set forth below, an interference proceeding will be initiated in this case similar to the one in 09/988,545.

## **Double Patenting**

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 20-47 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-13 of U.S. Patent No. 6,399,551, claims 1-17 of US 5,911,835, and claims 1-53 of US 6,564,812. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other

Application/Control Number: 10/826,286

Art Unit: 1751

because claims 1-13 of U.S. Patent No. 6,399,551, claims 1-17 of US 5,911,835, and claims 1-53 of US 6,564,812 encompass the material limitations of the instant claims.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to remove etching and resist material from a substrate using a composition containing hydroxylamine, an organic solvent, a chelating agent, water, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims, with a reasonable expectation of success, because claims 1-13 of U.S. Patent No. 6,399,551, claims 1-17 of US 5,911,835, and claims 1-53 of US 6,564,812 suggest removing etching and resist material from a substrate using a composition containing hydroxylamine, an organic solvent, a chelating agent, water, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims.

Claims 20-47 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-20 of copending Application No. 10/442858 and claims 20-22, 24-26, and 40-63 of 09/988545. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 1-20 of 10/442858 and claims 20-22, 24-26, and 40-63 of 09/988545 encompass the material limitations of the instant claims.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to remove etching and resist material from a substrate using a composition containing hydroxylamine, an organic solvent, a chelating agent, water, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific proportions as recited

Application/Control Number: 10/826,286

Art Unit: 1751

by the instant claims, with a reasonable expectation of success, because claims 1-20 of copending Application No. 10/442858 and claims 20-22, 24-26, and 40-63 of 09/988545 suggest removing etching and resist material from a substrate using a composition containing hydroxylamine, an organic solvent, a chelating agent, water, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

## Conclusion

2. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Remaining references cited but not relied upon are considered to be cumulative to or less pertinent than those relied upon or discussed above.

Applicant is reminded that any evidence to be presented in accordance with 37 CFR 1.131 or 1.132 should be submitted before final rejection in order to be considered timely.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory R. Del Cotto whose telephone number is (571) 272-1312. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Fri. from 8:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yogendra Gupta can be reached on (571) 272-1316. The fax phone

Art Unit: 1751

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Gregory R. Del Cotto Primary Examiner Art Unit 1751 Page 5

GRD September 15, 2004